



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,152	01/20/2004	Edward E. Orner	POLY32	2560

6980 7590 08/30/2006

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
600 PEACHTREE STREET, NE  
ATLANTA, GA 30308

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 49-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Omura et al. (US 2003/0001825).

As to claim 49, Omura et al. discloses in figs. 29-30, a support frame for interactive display comprising: a base having positionable first and second arms (figs. 29-30); mobile elements (616, fig. 30) mounted to the first and second arms; and a vertically adjustable support extending from the base configured to receive an interactive display (201, fig. 29).

As to claim 50, Omura et al. discloses further wherein the first and second arms of the base element collapse towards the support (figs. 29-30).

As to claim 51, Omura et al. discloses further comprising a power source (619) mounted to the support frame (600, fig. 30).

As to claims 52-56, Omura et al. discloses in figs. 29-30, Omura et al. discloses an inherent the power source (619) is rechargeable (see 0248).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-23, 25-38, 40, 43-48, 57-59, 61 and 70-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura et al. (US 2003/0001825).

As to claims 1, 70, Omura et al. discloses in figs. 29-30, a support frame for an interactive display comprising: a base element (fig. 29); at least one support extending vertically (603, fig. 30) from the the base elment; and a positioning element housed within the at least one support, the positioning element configured to receive the interactive display (201, fig. 29), wherein the positioning element counterbalances the weight of the interactive display allowing vertical repositioning of the interactive display with a force. However, Omura et al. does not discloses the weight of the interactive display with a force of less than about 25 pounds.

It would have been obvious to for Omura et al.'s system to have the weight of the interactive display with a force of less than about 25 pounds as claimed since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the weight of a system.

See In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955) and

In re Reven, 156 USPQ 679 (CCPA 1968).

As to claim 2, is similar claim 1 with a force ranges from about 1.0 ounce to about 3 pounds.

As to claims 3 and 19, Omura et al. discloses further, a plurality of mobile element (616, fig. 30) mounted on the base element.

As to claim 6, Omura et al. discloses further comprising an interactive display (201, fig. 29) mounted thereon.

As to claims 7 and 26, Omura et al. discloses further, a plurality of vertical supports (figs. 29-30).

As to claims 8, 27, Omura et al. discloses further, at least one horizontal support connects at least two of the plurality of vertical supports (figs. 29-30).

As to claims 33, 40, 61 and 71, Omura et al. discloses further, wherein the interactive display is selected from the group consisting of an electronic whiteboard (see display board system 100, fig. 30).

As to claim 10, Omura et al. discloses further, comprising a power source (619) secured to the support frame (frame unit 600, fig. 30).

As to claims 11-15, 28-32, 44-48, and 72, Omura et al. discloses an inherent the power source is rechargeable (see 0248).

As to claim 18, Omura et al. discloses in figs. 29-30, a support frame for an interactive display comprising: a base element; a support (603) extending vertically from the base element configured to receive an interactive display; and a power source affixed to the support frame for powering the interactive display (201, fig. 29).

As to claims 20, 21, Omura et al. discloses wherein the support comprise a vertical positioning element (fig. 30)., and provides an inherent sufficient force to counterbalance the weight of the interactive display.

As to claims 16, 17, Omura et al. discloses in figs. 29-30, Omura et al. discloses an inherent the power source (619) is rechargeable (see 0248). However, Omura et al. does not disclose wherein the power supply includes a power level indicator and viewed from the front of the support frame.

It would have been obvious for Omura et al.'s system to have the power supply includes a power level indicator and viewed from the front of the support frame because Omura et al. disclose a video section (613) near to the power supply (619) and then power supply (619) also a power level indicator level.

As to claims 22, 23 are similar claim 2 and discussed above.

As to claims 25-27 are similar claims 7, 8 and discussed above.

As to claims 34-38 are similar claims 25-27 and discussed above.

As to claim 43, Omura et al. discloses further, comprising a computer (104, fig. 27) in communication with the interactive display (201, fig. 29).

5. Claims 41, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura et al. (US 2003/0001825 A1) in view of Martin (US 2002/0118180).

As to claim 41, Omura et al. does not disclose further comprising a projector for projecting an image onto a surface of the interactive display.

Art Unit: 2629

Martin discloses in fig. 1, a interactive graphic system having the image projected by LCD panel (9) and a projector (7 ) on the board (see 0044).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the projector on the board as taught by Martin into the system of Omura et al. for producing the claimed invention because this would provide the user script and reproduces such information at a sufficient rate that user drawings on the board become interactive (see 0044).

As to claim 42, Omura et al. discloses further, the surface (201, fig. 29) is a touch sensitive surface.

6. Claims 4, 5, 24, 39, 60, 62-67, 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura et al. (US 2003/0001825) in view of Jakobs et al (US 5,300,943).

As to claim 62, Omura et al. discloses in figs. 29-30, an electronic whiteboard system comprising:

An electronic whiteboard having a wireless communication device, wherein the electronic whiteboard is mounted on a mobile support frame (600), the mobile support frame comprising: a wheeled base element (616); and a positioning element extending vertical from the base element configured to receive the electronic whiteboard and provide sufficient force to counterbalance the weight of the electronic whiteboard to maintain the electronic whiteboard at a desired vertical position.

However, Omura et al. does not disclose a hydraulic positioning element.

Jakobs et al. discloses in fig. 1, an electronic image processing workstation (1) comprising a support base (10) having adjustments by using the hydraulic system (see col. 8, lines 63-66 and col. 8, lines 22-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the hydraulic system as taught by Jakobs et al. into the electronic whiteboard of Omura et al. for producing the claimed invention because this would provide the adjustments are executed with the assistance of built-in electronic motors and actuators that make the system will be cooler when it's operation.

Claims 4,5, 24, 39 and 60 are similar claim 62 and discussed above.

Claims 62-67 and 69 as discussed above.

7. Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura et al. (US 2003/0001825) and Jakobs et al. (US 5,300,943) as applied to claim 62 above, and further in view of Martin (US 2002/0118180).

Omura et al. and Jakobs et al. do not disclose a projector for projecting an image on a touch-sensitive surface.

Martin discloses in fig.1, an interactive graphic system having the image projected by LCD panel 9 and a projector (7 ) on the board (see 0044).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the projector on the board as taught by Martin into the system of Omura et al. for producing the claimed invention because this would provide the user script and reproduces such information at a sufficient rate that user drawings on the board become interactive (see 0044).



*Correspondence*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7698. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI, FROM 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Kimnhung Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
August 25, 2006